

Remarks

This Response is provided in response to a non-final Office Action (Paper No. 6) mailed February 12, 2004. The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by prior art, and objected to claims 3-19, which would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The hereinabove amendments are believed to be proper, do not introduce new matter, serve to broaden rather than narrow the subject matter of the amended claims, and further serve to place the application in proper condition for reconsideration and allowance.

Support for newly added claims 21-33 is found in the specification including page 20, line 1 through page 21, line 29 and the discussion of FIG. 7 beginning at page 12, line 1 through page 14, line 26. Claim 12 has been amended to place the claim in better form for reconsideration and allowance. Claim 30 is substantially canceled claim 20 rewritten to present the claim in better form for reconsideration and allowance under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. The Applicant points out that new independent claim 21 now stands as the broadest claim presented.

The proper examination of claim 30, requires an identification of the corresponding structure, material, or acts in the specification and equivalents thereof, that carry out the functions recited in the claim, and 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, applies to the Examiner during prosecution of the patent application. *In re Donaldson Company, Inc.*, 16 F.3d 1189 (Fed.Cir.1994)(*en banc*). Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6, “structure disclosed in the specification is ‘corresponding structure’ only if the specification or prosecution history clearly associates that structure to the function recited in the claim. This duty to link or associate structure to function is the *quid pro quo* for the convenience of employing 112, paragraph 6.” *B. Braun Medical*, 43 USPQ2d at 1900.

In claim 30, the function called for by the element of the claim expressed as a means clause, “steps for inserting a first member onto a second member” is properly construed to at least include; directing a robotic arm (214) to pick (300 and discussion of FIG. 11) and place (320 and discussion of FIG. 12) the head stack assembly into the basedeck assembly (168); and determining compliance of mechanical resistance encountered as the head stack assembly engages the basedeck in relation to installation

force magnitude and rate of change of installation force magnitude, over time and position (340 and discussion of FIG. 13).

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,467,153 issued to William Orson Butts et al., October 22, 2002 (Butts '153). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Butts '153 fails to show at least the claim elements "directing a robotic arm to pick and place the head stack assembly into the basedeck assembly," and "determining compliance of mechanical resistance encountered as the head stack assembly engages the basedeck in relation to installation force magnitude and rate of change of installation force magnitude, over time and position" of claim 1.

Butts '153 shows a method for manufacturing a disk drive that includes; assembling, servo writing, and performing a head disk assembly test upon the head disk assembly in the clean room. The head disk assembly is then electrically connected to a controller printed circuit board assembly to form a drive-under-test, and transported to an integrated test system and electrically connected thereto. The integrated tests system performs substantially all of the required manufacturing tests upon the drive-under-test. (see Abstract; FIG. 1, in conjunction with col. 6, lines 42 through 67; and FIG. 2, in conjunction with col. 8, lines 3 through 36).

There is no showing within Butts '153 of a method for installing a head stack assembly into a basedeck assembly to form a head disc assembly of a disc drive. Butts '153 simply discloses "... according to contemporary methodology, a HDA 160 is fabricated 14 within a clean room 10. The HDA 160 is fabricated within the clean room 10 so as to mitigate undesirable contamination thereof. As those skilled in the art will appreciate, such contamination, particularly of the heads, disks and drive mechanism thereof, may adversely affect the performance of the drive," (see col. 6, line 42 through 48). Butts '153 makes no further showing regarding a method of forming a head disc assembly, as such, Butts '153 shows neither the first or second element of claim 1.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 1, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and passage of claim 1, along with each claim depending from claim 1. The Applicant further requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), on the basis

that claim 2 further limits allowable claim 1, and the withdrawal of the objection to claims 3-19, on the basis that these claims depend from allowable claims 1 and 2.

Objection of Claims 3-19 as depending from rejected base claims:

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowability of claims 3-19, if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of their associated base claims and any intervening claims. However, at this time and based on the foregoing, the Applicant has elected to not rewrite claims 3-19 into their independent form.


Conclusion

This Response is intended to be a complete response to the Office Action (Paper No. 6) mailed February 12, 2004.

It is submitted that each amended claim and each new claim presented herein complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, adds no new matter, and facilitates furtherance in the prosecution of the application. Entry of the hereinabove amendments is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the below listed Attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Daniel P. Dooley, Registration No. 46,369
Randall K. McCarthy, Registration No. 39,297
Bill D. McCarthy, Registration No. 26,772
Mitchell K. McCarthy, Registration No. 38,794
Fellers, Snider, Blankenship, Bailey and Tippens, P.C.
Bank One Tower
100 N. Broadway, Suite 1700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
Telephone: (405) 232-0621
Facsimile: (405) 232-9659